



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/880,417	06/13/2001	Andrei V. Gudkov	27611/37477	6487
4743	7590	07/09/2004	EXAMINER	
MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP 6300 SEARS TOWER 233 S. WACKER DRIVE CHICAGO, IL 60606			COOK, REBECCA	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1614	

DATE MAILED: 07/09/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/880,417

Applicant(s)

GUDKOV ET AL.

Examiner

Rebecca Cook

Art Unit

1614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 April 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 33,34 and 46-49 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 33,34 and 46-49 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Terminal Disclaimer

The terminal disclaimer filed on 4/5/04 disclaiming the terminal portion of any patent granted on this application which would extend beyond the expiration date of 09/947,747 has been reviewed and is accepted. The terminal disclaimer has been recorded.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 33-34, 47-49 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 5-8 of U.S. Patent No. 6,593,353. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the instant method of reducing cell death attributable to a stress-inducing event, including cancer treatment, by treating a host with a p53 inhibitor to reversibly inhibit p53 activity is rendered obvious by the method of '353 of reducing normal cell death attributable to cancer by administering a temporary

Art Unit: 1614

p53 inhibitor. It is obvious that the inhibitor of the instant claims would include the compound of '353. In the absence of a copy of the original restriction requirement, currently not available to the Examiner, Applicants' argument that the terminal disclaimer is not proper because the present application is a divisional of the parent application is not persuasive. That is because it is not clear that the invention of the instant claims is entirely distinct from the invention of '353.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 33-34 and 46-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

For rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, the following factors must be considered (In re Wands, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1404):

1) Nature of invention, 2) State of prior art, 3) Level of ordinary skill in the art, 4) Level of predictability in the art, 5) Amount of direction and guidance provided by the inventor, 6) Existence of working examples, 7) Breadth of claims, 8) Quantity of experimentation needed to make or use the invention based on the content of the disclosure.

The instant claims are drawn to a method of preventing cell death. This would include keeping cells alive forever. However, at this time there is no compound that is known that keeps cells living forever. Based on the unpredictable nature of the invention and state of the prior art and the extreme breadth of the claims, one skilled in the art could not perform the claimed process without undue experimentation, see *In re Armbruster* 185 USPQ 152 CCPA 1975.

Amending claim 34 to recite as follows and canceling claim 33 will overcome this rejection:

“A method of reversibly inhibiting p53 for a sufficient time to allow normal cells in a host to recover from a stress-inducing event affecting said cells said method comprising treating the host with a therapeutically effective amount of a p53 inhibitor to reversibly inhibit p53 activity, wherein the stress-inducing event is selected from the group consisting of a cancer treatment, a trauma, hyperthermia, hypoxia, ischemia, stroke, a burn, a seizure, a tissue or organ prior to transplanting, preparing the host for a bone-marrow transplant and DNA damage.”

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 33-34 and 46-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by 4,497,817 (Murase et al).

Art Unit: 1614

Murase discloses (abstract, column 3, lines 29-32) that the compound of claim 47 is useful to suppress rejection of tissue transplant. It would be inherent that this method would prevent cell death or allow cells to recover from the stress-inducing event of tissue transplant. The instant claims differ over Murase in reciting that the compounds are p53 inhibitors that reversibly inhibit p53 activity. However, that is the mechanism of action by which method works and it would be inherent that it also the mechanism of action for the method of Murase.

Claims 33-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by CA130:119241 (Chernov). Chernov discloses (abstract) a method of preventing cell death (apoptosis) attributable to the stress-inducing events, including cancer treatment with adriamycin, by treating the host with salicylate, a p53 inhibitor which reversibly inhibits p53 activity.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Cook whose telephone number is (571) 272-0571. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chris Low, can be reached on (571) 272-0951.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to Renee Jones (571) 272-0547 in Customer Service.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

The official fax number is 703-872-9806

Application/Control Number: 09/880,417

Page 6

Art Unit: 1614

Rebecca Cook

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Rebecca Cook". The signature is written in black ink and is positioned below the printed name.

Primary Examiner

Art Unit 1614

July 7, 2004